

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 12, 2008 the Office noted that claims 1, 4-9 and 11-22 were pending and rejected claims 1, 4-9 and 11-22. Claims 1, 9 and 19 have been amended, claim 4 has been canceled, and thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1, 5-9 and 11-22 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6-9, 11-12 and 15-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sonksen, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046429 in view of Kawai, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0122424 in further view of Farinacci, U.S. Patent No. 7,016,351. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Sonsken discusses a packet processing apparatus implemented in a plurality of pipeline stages or a group of stages configured for a particular operation.

Kawai discusses an interface device that is used to accommodate packets from a high-speed line efficiently and to reduce a processing load on a back stage caused by routing control.

Farinacci discusses placing multicast delivery tree information in the header of an encapsulated multicast packet, thereby relieving the intermediate routers from maintaining any state information about the multicast groups.

The Applicant has amended claim 1 to further recite "the change in the length of said information of said data packet (100) comprises: adding to the length a value representing a length of a portion of the at least one of the dummy header (305) and dummy tail (310) of said intermediate data packet (315), the portion storing information of the communications system, and subtracting from the length a value representing a portion of said intermediate data packet representing empty information after said processing, ***the method further comprising the step of determining, upon said intermediate data packet (315) exiting the last of said at least two processing stages (205b,205c), (540) whether any bits of at least one of the header end and the tail end of said intermediate data packet (315) are superfluous, then removing (545) said superfluous bits from at least one of the header end and the tail end of said intermediate data packet (315).***" (Emphasis added). Support for the amendment may be found, for example, cancelled claim 4, in Figs. 2; 3a-3d; 4a-4d; 5; and 6a-6c and the paragraph spanning page 9, line 31 through page 10, line 20. Claims 9 and 19 have been amended in a similar manner to claim 1. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the amendment to the claims.

The prior art of record fails to disclose determining, upon said intermediate data packet (315) exiting the last of said at least two processing stages (205b,205c), (540) whether any bits at least one of the header end and the tail end of said intermediate data packet (315) are superfluous, then removing (545) said superfluous bits from at least one of the header end and the tail end of said intermediate data packet (315).

It is further noted the prior art of records fails to disclose when changing the length of the data packet that each of the steps of adding, subtracting and determining in the last stage are performed. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Office appears to assert that Farinacci only discloses adding a dummy tail to an intermediate packet.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Sonksen, Kwarai and Farinacci, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 1, 9 and 19 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sonksen in view of Kwarai in view of Farinacci in further view of Hultsch WO 99/60708. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Hultsch adds nothing to the combination of Sonksen, Kwarai and Farinacci as applied against the independent claims.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Sonksen, Kawarai, Farinacci and Hultsch, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 4 and 5.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sonksen in view of Kawarai in view of Farinacci in further view of Lee, U.S. Patent No. 6,996,117. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Lee adds nothing to the combination of Sonksen, Kawarai and Farinacci as applied against the independent claims. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Sonksen, Kawarai, Farinacci and Lee, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 13.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sonksen in view of Kawarai in view of Farinacci in further view of Song, U.S. Patent No. 5,818,894. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Song adds nothing to the deficiencies of Sonksen, Kawarai and Farinacci as applied to the independent claims argued above. Therefore, the Sonksen, Kawarai, Farinacci and Song, taken in separately or in combination, fail to render obvious claim 14.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1, 5-9 and 11-22 continue to be allowable. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/lad